arXiv:1703.07546v1 [math.OC] 22 Mar 2017

Combining Homotopy Methods and Numerical Optimal Control to Solve Motion Planning Problems

Kristoffer Bergman and Daniel Axehill

Abstract— **This paper presents a systematic approach for computing local solutions to motion planning problems in non-convex environments using numerical optimal control techniques. It extends the use of state-of-the-art tools from numerical optimal control to problems typically solved using motion planners based on randomized or graph search. The general principle is to define a homotopy that perturbs, or preferably relaxes, the original problem to an easily solved problem. By combining a Sequential Quadratic Programming (SQP) method with a homotopy approach that gradually transforms the problem from a relaxed one to the original one, practically relevant locally optimal solutions to the motion planning problem can be computed. The approach is demonstrated in motion planning problems in challenging 2D and 3D environments.**

I. INTRODUCTION

Depending on the field of subject and the applications, the meaning of the term "optimal motion planning" may vary [1]. In this paper, the term will be used to denote the problem of finding a feasible and locally optimal trajectory for a dynamical system from an initial state to a goal state in an environment that includes obstacles. Hence, this is a quite broad notion which includes several applications such as finding trajectories for autonomous cars (DARPA Grand and Urban Challenges), autonomous underwater vehicles and trajectories for robot manipulators.

In the literature, there are different methods that can be used to solve motion planning problems and produce feasible or optimal trajectories. For more information and details on some of these methods, the reader is referred to standard literature such as [1].

In general, finding a feasible trajectory for a system with nonlinear dynamics in complex non-convex environments, such as bugtraps and mazes, is a challenging problem. Most of the work in this area has been focused on sampled-based and graph search based methods, which are able to handle sampled maps and challenging nonlinear dynamics [1]. However, these methods suffer from the *curse of dimensionality* as the dimension of the search space to explore grows. Furthermore, lattice planners, a commonly used graph search method, typically rely on a preprocessing step offline where so called motion primitives are precomputed [1]. This step limits the flexibility of the method when applied to problems with, *e.g.*, dynamics that change over time.

Another approach is to use numerical optimal control methods to solve the motion planning problem. However, the difficulty with these methods is that they are sensitive to initialization, especially in non-convex environments [2]. As a result, these methods are considered less suitable and are rarely used for these types of problems.

In recent years, the interest within research on sampling-based motion planning methods with focus on optimality, such as Rapidly-exploring Random Trees (RRT*), Probabilistic Roadmaps (PRM*) [3] and Stable Sparse RRT (SST*) [4], has increased. The original versions of RRT* and PRM* can not handle nonholonomic dynamical constraints. An extension of the RRT* algorithm to such problem classes is presented in [5]. However, this algorithm is dependent on a steering function, which in the case of exact steering for a general nonholonomic dynamic system corresponds to solving a boundary value problem to connect samples in the tree. Another approach is to use RRT to sample the input to a closed-loop system with an underlying controller [6].

In [7] they use a method named *Time Elastic Band*, in which a weighted multi-objective optimization problem is solved by relaxing and adding the dynamics of the system to the objective function. However, the method is designed for a specific kind of dynamics.

One recent method of graph search based planning combined with numerical optimal control is [8], where a state lattice is generated for a general 2-trailer system using numerical optimization, which can be combined with any graph-based search algorithm, such as A*. The method is computationally efficient since only a graph search needs to be performed online. However, the solution is only resolution complete, and it requires a computationally demanding preprocessing step where motion primitives are computed and the search tree is prepared.

Using optimal control to solve motion planning problems has been investigated by many researchers. In the early paper of [9] the authors propose an optimal control approach to compute a minimum time solution to a motion planning problem. However, the desired geometric path is assumed given. In [10], a motion planning problem for a robot in an environment with obstacles is considered. Here, both the obstacle constraints and the system dynamical equations are treated simultaneously by incorporating methods from numerical optimal control to the planning problem.

One recent publication where the use of newly developed tools for numerical optimal control are used to study vehicle-maneuver and trajectory generation is [11]. In that publication three different maneuvers are considered for models of varying complexity, and the optimal control solutions are presented and analyzed. The result indicates that it is often

This work was partially supported by the Wallenberg Autonomous Systems and Software Program (WASP).

K. Bergman and D. Axehill are with the Division of Automatic Control, Linköping University, Sweden {kristoffer.bergman, daniel.axehill}@liu.se

non-trivial to find an initial guess that solves the problem.

Homotopy, or continuation, based methods have been used to solve manipulation planning problems [12], where the constraints are relaxed and iteratively introduced to obtain the original problem formulation. The relaxed subproblems are solved using a geometric planner based on dynamic programming techniques, which means that nonholonomic dynamical systems can not be considered. Another example is [13], where planning for a nonholonomic mobile robot is carried out by first using a geometric planner to satisfy all geometric constraints, and then introduce the nonholonomic constraints iteratively.

Homotopy methods have also been used to solve two-point boundary value problems [14], [15], where the homotopy method has been combined with iterative search methods to generate solutions for problems with nonlinear dynamics when the initial guess is far from the optimal solution. However, the case with nonlinear inequality constraints representing non-convex obstacles has not been considered.

In this work, it will be shown how state-of-the-art methods from numerical optimal control can be combined with a homotopy method into a new method that solves motion planning problems with challenging geometry of the feasible set.

II. OPTIMAL CONTROL PRELIMINARIES

The traditional optimal control problem is to compute an optimal control input to a dynamical system such that an objective function is minimized, subject to initial and terminal constraints [16]. By also enforcing the solution to satisfy certain inequality constraints, the problem will be denoted a *constrained continuous-time optimal control* (CCTOC) problem. It is defined in its general form as

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{x(t),u(t),t_f}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \Phi(x(t_f)) + \int_{t_0}^{t_f} f_0(x(t),u(t))dt \\ \text{subject to} \quad & x(t_0) = x_{t_0}, \\ & \dot{x}(t) = f(x(t),u(t)),\ \forall t \in [t_0,t_f] \\ & g(x(t),u(t)) \preceq 0,\ \forall t \in [t_0,t_f] \\ & \Psi(x(t_f)) = x_{t_f}, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where x_{t_0} and x_{t_f} are the initial and final states, $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are the states, $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are the control inputs, $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^n$ describes the system dynamics, $g : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^p$ are the inequality constraint functions that determine the feasible region, $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ and $f_0 : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}$ form the objective function and $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is the terminal constraint function. The final time t_f may, or may not, be an optimization variable [16].

A. Solving the Optimal Control Problem

The CCTOC problem (1) can be solved using several different approaches, see *e.g.* [17], [18], [2]. In this paper, we are using a direct method, in which the constrained optimal control problem is reformulated into a nonlinear programming (NLP) problem. The main reasons for this choice are that indirect formulations are often hard to solve in practice [2], and that there exist several good software packages for solving the reformulated NLP problem with these methods, such as ACADO [19], IPOPT [20], SNOPT [21] and several more.

In general, the solution to an NLP problem is found using iterative schemes [22]. The very basic idea of an iterative solver is presented in Algorithm 1. The major difference between different iterative solvers is how to compute the update direction and step size. Different solvers also use different means to avoid getting stuck in local optimal solutions: some do not care at all about this, while there exist methods like, *e.g.*, genetic algorithms (GAs) where an attempt to avoid these are made [23]. An important aspect to get good solutions (*i.e.* local solutions of practical relevance) is the choice of the initial iterate x_0 in Algorithm 1, and for some methods there exist structured ways or good heuristics to do this. For more information on numerical solvers for NLP problems, the reader is referred to standard literature such as [22].

Algorithm 1 Outline of iterative NLP solver

1: Given an initial iterate x_0
2: $k \leftarrow 0$
3: **while** x_k not locally optimal **do**
4: Compute an update direction p_k and step size α_k
5: $x_{k+1} \leftarrow x_k + \alpha_k p_k$
6: **end while**

In this work, we have used ACADO for solving the CCTOC problem. ACADO uses an SQP method combined with support for different types of discretization methods and integrators to solve the CCTOC problem (see [19] for further details). In order to obtain a finite dimensional NLP problem, we have used the direct multiple shooting discretization method, combined with the classical Runge-Kutta integrator [2].

B. Nonlinear Programming Formulation

Once the discretization of the CCTOC problem is completed, it can be formulated as an NLP problem. Since we are using a multiple shooting approach, the problem is formulated as a collection of N phases. If we assume piecewise constant control signals u_i, each interval can be solved numerically, starting from an artificial initial state value s_i

$$\begin{aligned} & \dot{x}_i(t) = f(x_i(t),u_i), \quad t \in [t_i,t_{i+1}], \\ & x_i(t_i) = s_i. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

This produces trajectory sequences $x_i(t;s_i,u_i)$ for each phase that are determined by the initial state values s_i and the constant control signal u_i. The NLP decision variables are then $[s_0,u_0,s_1,u_1,\ldots,s_N]$ [24], which gives the following NLP formulation of the CCTOC problem, assuming that the cost function for the final state is zero and that the terminal constraint function is the identity function

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{u}}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} l_i(s_i,u_i) = L(\mathbf{s},\mathbf{u}) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & s_0 = x_{t_0}, \\ & s_{i+1} = x_i(t_{i+1};s_i,u_i),\ \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_{0,N-1} \\ & g(s_i,u_i) \preceq 0,\ \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_{0,N} \\ & s_N = x_{t_f}. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Here, $\mathbf{s},\mathbf{u}$ are the vectors containing all the discretized states and control signals, and the constraints $s_{i+1} = x_i(t_{i+1};s_i,u_i)$ are the so called *defect* constraints that connect the phases. The objective function is a sum of the numerically computed integrals for each phase [24].

C. Sequential Quadratic Programming

Once the CCTOC problem has been reformulated as an NLP problem, it is possible to solve it using, *e.g.*, SQP. If we define the notation $\mathbf{w} = [s_0,u_0,s_1,u_1,\ldots,s_N]$ for the optimization variables in (3), an SQP method computes a search direction $\mathbf{p}$ by approximating the NLP by a quadratic program (QP) at iterate $(\mathbf{w}_k,\lambda_k)$, where λ_k are the Lagrange multipliers from the solution in the last iterate, by solving

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\mathbf{p}}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{p}^T\mathbf{B}_k\mathbf{p} + \nabla L(\mathbf{w}_k)^T\mathbf{p} \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_k)^T\mathbf{p} + F(\mathbf{w}_k) = 0, \\ & \nabla G(\mathbf{w}_k)^T\mathbf{p} + G(\mathbf{w}_k) \preceq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Here, F contains all the discrete time dynamic system constraints as well as initial and final constraints and G all the inequality constraint functions. $\mathbf{B}_k$ denotes the approximation of the Hessian of the Lagrangian to the NLP, ∇F, ∇G the Jacobian matrices of F and G respectively, and ∇L is the gradient of the objective function. For more details, see [22].

Due to the equivalence between SQP and Newton's method, the search direction $\mathbf{p}$ can either be defined as the solution to the quadratic program (4), or as the search direction generated by Newton's method for the corresponding NLP problem (3) for any fixed working set (*i.e.* the set of inequality constraints that holds with equality). In [22] it is stated that the SQP method eventually will find the optimal active set during the SQP iterations under certain mild conditions. Once that is done, what remains is basically Newton's method on a nonlinear system of equations.

III. Continuation/Homotopy Methods

Since solvers for a system of nonlinear equations are sensitive to the choice of initial iterate x_0, they are in danger of converging to a local minimum which does not coincide with a global minimum, or not converging at all, for difficult problems. Convergence to a globally optimal solution might be too much to ask for, but what is desired in practice is convergence to a local solution of practical relevance. One way to deal with this is to use so called *homotopy*, or *continuation* methods [25]. Instead of solving the original problem directly, one can set up an easy problem for which the solution is more or less obvious, and then successively transform the problem towards the original and more difficult one.




Fig. 1: An example illustrating homeomorphic and non-homeomorphic transformations of objects in 2D. The transformations from the top objects to the bottom objects are not homeomorphic due to the hole in the middle.

Example 1: If the problem is to find a root for the nonlinear equation $F(x) = 0$ ($F : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$), the homotopy method instead focuses on finding a root to the *homotopy map*

$$H(x,\gamma) = \gamma F(x) + (1-\gamma)G(x) \tag{5}$$

where $\gamma \in [0,1]$, from now on denoted *homotopy parameter*, and $G : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$. The basic idea is to solve a sequence of $n+1$ problems $H(x,\gamma) = 0$, for $\gamma = \gamma_0 < \gamma_1 < \ldots < \gamma_n = 1$. If the roots are relatively easy to find for $G(x)$, it should be easy to find a first iterate x_0. Then for any problem $k \in [0,n]$ along the homotopy path, given a starting point x_k that is the approximate solution from $H(x,\gamma_k) = 0$, the next approximate solution x_{k+1} is calculated by solving $H(x,\gamma_{k+1}) = 0$. This can be done using an iterative method such as Newton's method, with x_k as initial iterate. If the difference between γ_k and γ_{k+1} is small enough, the method will converge [25].

The main contribution in this work is to combine this method with the NLP formulation of the CCTOC problem in (3), but the method as such can be combined with any general NLP formulation. If we separate the inequality constraints g into two parts

- $g_C : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^r$, that contains all the convex inequality constraint functions and
- $g_H : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^q$, $r+q = p$, that contains all the non-convex inequality constraint functions,

it is possible to replace the non-convex inequality constraints with the homotopy map $h : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^q$, which represents a continuous transformation of g_H with respect to the homotopy parameter γ. We require that h is a *homeomorphism*[1] with respect to the inequality constraint functions.

Definition 1: A function $f : X \to Y$ between two topological spaces X and Y is called a homeomorphism if

1) f is a one-to-one and onto mapping (bijection), and
2) both f and f^{-1} are continuous [1].

[1]The method can be generalized to handle a sequence of homeomorphic mappings.




Fig. 2: An example illustrating an environment with two homotopy classes. The trajectories can not be continuously transformed into each other due to the obstacle.

An illustrating example of homeomorphic transformations can be found in Figure 1. The reason to require that h is a homeomorphism is easily motivated in the context of an CCTOC problem.

Definition 2: Two trajectories are said to be in the same *homotopy class* if they can be continuously transformed from one to another without intersecting any obstacles, while keeping their endpoints fixed [27].

An example of an enviroment with two homotopy classes is shown in Figure 2: one class above the obstacle and one class below. Hence, the homeomorphism requirement on h prevents the introduction of new, and removal of existing, homotopy classes, while continuously perturbing the available free space in each of the existing homotopy classes when γ is updated.

Now, using the homotopy map, we can write the NLP in (3) as

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{u}}{\text{minimize}} \quad & L(\mathbf{s},\mathbf{u}) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & s_0 = x_{t_0} \\ & s_{i+1} = x_i(t_{i+1}; s_i, u_i),\ \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_{0,N-1} \\ & g_C(s_i,u_i) \preceq 0,\ \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_{0,N} \\ & h(s_i,u_i,\gamma) \preceq 0,\ \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_{0,N} \\ & s_N = x_{t_f}. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

With this formulation, we can solve the problem iteratively by first solving a problem with simple or even convex inequality constraint functions, and then gradually perturb the non-convex inequality constraints by increasing the γ-parameter. The proposed method shares similarities with the *barrier method*, where the inequality constraints are relaxed and added to the objective function [26]. Then, a sequence of problems is solved, starting from a simpler problem and then approaching the solution to the original one.

One important special type of perturbation structure is when the optimization problem is gradually relaxed (in optimization sense) as the homotopy parameter is decreased from 1 to 0. In this case, the objective function value for iterate $[\mathbf{s}_k, \mathbf{u}_k, \gamma_k]$ will always be greater than or equal to the objective value for the previous iterate $[\mathbf{s}_{k-1}, \mathbf{u}_{k-1}, \gamma_{k-1}]$ as the problem is solved for a strictly increasing γ, *i.e.*

$$L^*(\mathbf{s}_k,\mathbf{u}_k) \geq L^*(\mathbf{s}_{k-1},\mathbf{u}_{k-1}), \quad \gamma_k > \gamma_{k-1}, \tag{7}$$

as the homotopy parameter is increased from 0 to 1.

IV. SEQUENTIAL HOMOTOPY QUADRATIC PROGRAMMING

In this section, an algorithm implementing the main contribution in this paper will be explained. The SQP subproblem (4) can be extended to also include the homotopy map

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\mathbf{p}}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{p}^T\mathbf{B}_k\mathbf{p} + \nabla L(\mathbf{w}_k)^T\mathbf{p} \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_k)^T\mathbf{p} + F(\mathbf{w}_k) = 0, \\ & \nabla G_c(\mathbf{w}_k)^T\mathbf{p} + G_c(\mathbf{w}_k) \preceq 0, \\ & \nabla H(\mathbf{w}_k,\gamma)^T\mathbf{p} + H(\mathbf{w}_k,\gamma) \preceq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where the inequalities have been divided into G_c, which contains all the convex inequality constraint functions, and H which contains all the homotopy mappings. We observe that for a fixed γ, the problem can be solved, as usual, by a standard SQP method to local optimality. Furthermore, for a fixed working set, the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) system is a system of nonlinear equations for which a standard homotopy approach as the one described in [25] can be used. What we now propose is to combine these two methods into one which we call Sequential Homotopy Quadratic Programming (SHQP). A general description of the algorithm is given in Algorithm 2, using notations from (8). It is inspired by Algorithm 18.3 in [22], which describes an SQP method using line search combined with a merit function to globalize the search for a solution. For more information about the Hessian approximations, line search procedure and merit functions in the algorithm, the reader is referred to [22].

The outer iteration in the algorithm corresponds to the homotopy mapping, while the inner iteration corresponds to the standard SQP algorithm. For every value of γ, the SQP steps are iterated until the termination test is completed, or until a maximum number of N_{SQP} SQP iterations has been performed. The termination test can vary with γ. For example, it might not be necessary to solve the intermediate problems to convergence, but instead accept a lower solution accuracy in the termination test. In the last step however, we would like the termination test to guarantee convergence. The same approach is used for the *inexact centering* in the barrier method [26], where the barrier parameter (homotopy parameter) is updated before Newton's method has fully converged.

An important question to consider is how to update γ in every step, *i.e.*, how to choose the step size Δ_γ. To obtain the fastest possible perturbation, we want to use as large steps as possible, such that the problem is solved with few homotopy iterations. However, if Δ_γ is too large, the initialization from the last step could be far from the solution to the updated problem. This will require many SQP iterations before the termination test is satisfied in Algorithm 2, or it might not converge at all. An illustrating example of this can be seen in Figure 3. This trade-off is shared both with standard homotopy methods as well as barrier methods [25], [26].

Algorithm 2 Sequential Homotopy Quadratic Programming

Choose line search and merit function parameters
$\gamma \leftarrow \gamma_{\text{init}}$, $\mathbf{w}_0 \leftarrow \mathbf{w}_{\text{init}}$, $\lambda_0 \leftarrow \lambda_{\text{init}}$
Choose an initial positive definite Hessian approx. $\mathbf{B}_0$
Evaluate $L(\mathbf{w}_0), \nabla L(\mathbf{w}_0), F(\mathbf{w}_0), \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_0), G_c(\mathbf{w}_0), \nabla G_c(\mathbf{w}_0)$
while $\gamma \leq 1$ **do**
 Evaluate $H(\mathbf{w}_0, \gamma)$, $\nabla H(\mathbf{w}_0, \gamma)$
 for $k = 0, 1 \ldots N_{\text{SQP}}$ **do**
 if Termination test satisfied **then**
 STOP
 end if
 Compute $\mathbf{p}_k$ by solving (8) at $\mathbf{w}_k, \lambda_k, \gamma$
 Calculate step size parameter $\alpha_k \in [\alpha_{\min}, 1]$
 $\mathbf{w}_{k+1} \leftarrow \mathbf{w}_k + \alpha_k \mathbf{p}_k$
 Evaluate $L(\mathbf{w}_{k+1}), \nabla L(\mathbf{w}_{k+1}), F(\mathbf{w}_{k+1}), \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_{k+1}), G_c(\mathbf{w}_{k+1}), \nabla G_c(\mathbf{w}_{k+1}), H(\mathbf{w}_{k+1}, \gamma), \nabla H(\mathbf{w}_{k+1}, \gamma)$
 Compute new Lagrange multipliers λ_{k+1}
 Update Hessian using a quasi-Newton formula
 end for
 $\gamma \leftarrow \gamma + \Delta_\gamma$
 $\mathbf{w}_0 \leftarrow \mathbf{w}_{k+1}$, $\lambda_0 \leftarrow \lambda_{k+1}$, $\mathbf{B}_0 \leftarrow \mathbf{B}_{k+1}$
 $L(\mathbf{w}_0), F(\mathbf{w}_0), G_c(\mathbf{w}_0) \leftarrow L(\mathbf{w}_{k+1}), F(\mathbf{w}_{k+1}), G_c(\mathbf{w}_{k+1})$
 $\nabla L(\mathbf{w}_0), \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_0), \nabla G_c(\mathbf{w}_0) \leftarrow \nabla L(\mathbf{w}_{k+1}), \nabla F(\mathbf{w}_{k+1}), \nabla G_c(\mathbf{w}_{k+1})$
end while

This method can be applied to the CCTOC problem (1) to generate trajectories offline or, because of the good warm-start properties of the SQP method, be used in real-time online using constantly updated information about the state and the environment. Hence, the proposed method has the potential to be used as a reactive planner in the motion planning case.

V. Obstacle Classification

In the motion planning application, the total number of SQP iterations in Algorithm 2 depends on several factors, such as Δ_γ and the nonlinear dynamics of the system. Other important factors are how large and what type of obstacles that are included in the CCTOC problem. We have categorized the obstacles in two main classes based on topological properties within the obstacle region. We denote these classes *Connected* and *Disconnected*.

The *Connected* obstacles are, in the original problem, connected with the complement to the feasible set of one convex inequality constraint. This specifies in which direction the *Connected* obstacle will grow during the homotopy phase, such that the space representing the feasible area does not introduce new homotopy classes. The name refers to the fact that in this case the infeasible area is topologically connected.

The *Disconnected* obstacles are obstacles *not* connected with the convex obstacle region. In this case, the homotopy map can, *e.g.*, be introduced with a point representing the center of the obstacle. Introducing a Disconnected obstacle will increase the number of homotopy classes for the trajectory planning problem.




Fig. 3: An example of a large step (a), and a small step (b) in γ, when an obstacle is perturbed by pushing it into the free space. The blue line represents the simulated trajectory from every multiple shooting point. The small step has already converged after one SQP iteration, while the large step is far from convergence.

Both these types of obstacles can be further divided into *Single* and *Chained* variants of the main classes. A *Single*-type obstacle is represented only by one constraint, while the *Chain*-type obstacles are represented by more than one constraint which are geometrically connected in a chain. The classification of obstacles will be of importance when choosing a homotopy map that satisfies the homeomorphism requirement. Example of these types of obstacles can be found in Figure 4. The chosen homotopy maps for (a)-(c) gradually introduces the obstacles from the outside of the free space. In (b), the long Chain-type obstacle is gradually extended like a "snake". In (d), the radius of the torus is large in the beginning and gradually reduced.

VI. Examples of Obstacle Representations

Algorithm 2 accepts all sorts of obstacle constraint representations that can be handled by SQP solvers, which means that the constraint function should be smooth. One example of practical relevance is to represent them as super-ellipsoids

$$\left(\frac{x-x_c}{r_x}\right)^k + \left(\frac{y-y_c}{r_y}\right)^k + \left(\frac{z-z_c}{r_z}\right)^k - 1 \geq 0, \qquad (9)$$

for $k = 2N$, $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. $[x_c, y_c, z_c]$ represents the center-point of the obstacle, while $[r_x, r_y, r_z]$ defines the three radii for the super-ellipsoid in each axis. Higher values of k produces obstacles with sharper edges. However, an increasing k will cause the linear approximation of the constraints used in the SQP iterations to be more numerically sensitive. This will in turn lead to a slower convergence. Some examples of super-ellipsoid obstacles with $k = 4$ can be found in Figure 4.

Example 2: Assume that the obstacle in Figure 3 is defined by the inequality

$$(x-4)^4 + \left(\frac{y}{6}\right)^4 - 1 \geq 0. \qquad (10)$$




Fig. 4: (a) and (b) show examples of *Connected-Single*, *Disconnected-Single* and *Connected-Chained* 2D-obstacles. (c) and (d) show examples of *Connected-Single* 3D-obstacles. In all examples, the area outside what is shown in the plot is prohibited, represented using a convex box constraint with suitable dimension.

This inequality can be replaced by the homotopy map

$$(x-4)^4+\left(\frac{y-6(1-\gamma)}{6}\right)^4-1\geq 0, \tag{11}$$

which will continuously move the obstacle into the free space when γ is increased from 0 to 1. For $\gamma=1$, we have the original formulation (10).

A second example we have used is to model an obstacle as a torus (illustrated in Figure 4 (d))

$$\left(R-\sqrt{(x-x_c)^2+(y-y_c)^2}\right)^2+(z-z_c)^2-r^2\geq 0). \tag{12}$$

Here, R defines the distance from the center of the torus to the center of the tube, and r is the radius of the tube.

VII. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section the numerical results from four different trajectory planning scenarios are presented. To produce the results, we have emulated Algorithm 2 for the sake of proof-of-concept, using a script that iteratively calls ACADO for solving the CCTOC problem (1) and replacing the non-convex inequality functions with the homotopy map. The practical difference compared to Algorithm 2 is that ACADO needs to redo all the initialization when an SQP-sequence has terminated. Hence, with the scripted version we introduce a lot of overhead, and we cannot exploit information such as Hessian approximations and gradient calculations in subsequent homotopy iterations. However, the results indicate what is possible to achieve using the proposed SHQP method. For all cases presented, we have used a constant homotopy step size Δ_γ. The SQP iterations are terminated after achieving an KKT accuracy of 10^{-2} for the intermediate homotopy iterations, and a final KKT accuracy of 10^{-5}.

A. Motion Models

The numerical results presented in this section are based on two different types of motion models. The first one is derived from the simple car model in [1]

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t)=\begin{bmatrix}\dot{x}(t)\\ \dot{y}(t)\\ \dot{\theta}(t)\\ \dot{v}(t)\\ \dot{\psi}(t)\end{bmatrix}=f(\mathbf{x}(t),\mathbf{u}(t))=\begin{bmatrix}v(t)\cos\theta(t)\\ v(t)\sin\theta(t)\\ v(t)\tan\psi(t)\\ u_v(t)\\ u_\psi(t)\end{bmatrix}. \tag{13}$$

Here, $\mathbf{x}=[x,y,\theta,v,\psi]$ is the state vector of the car which represents the position, heading, speed and steering angle, respectively. The control signal to the system is $\mathbf{u}=\left[u_v,u_\psi\right]$ which represents the change rate in speed and steering angle, respectively. The steering angle is limited to $-\frac{\pi}{4}\leq\psi(t)\leq\frac{\pi}{4}$ and the control signals are limited to $-2\leq u_v(t)\leq 2$ and $-\frac{\pi}{3}\leq u_\psi(t)\leq\frac{\pi}{3}$. The speed of the car can be both positive (forward motion) and negative (reverse motion), limited to $-1\leq v(t)\leq 1$.

The second model is an extension to allow movements in 3D. For this, we have used a model representing a simple fixed-wing aircraft

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t)=\begin{bmatrix}\dot{x}(t)\\ \dot{y}(t)\\ \dot{\theta}(t)\\ \dot{z}(t)\\ \dot{v}(t)\\ \dot{\psi}(t)\\ \dot{\phi}(t)\end{bmatrix}=\begin{bmatrix}v(t)\cos\theta(t)\sin\phi(t)\\ v(t)\sin\theta(t)\sin\phi(t)\\ v(t)\tan\psi(t)\\ v(t)\cos\phi(t)\\ u_v(t)\\ u_\psi(t)\\ u_\phi(t)\end{bmatrix}. \tag{14}$$


This model also contains states that represent the altitude, $z(t)$, and elevation angle, $\phi(t)$. The magnitude and direction of the velocity vector is controlled by changing u_v,u_ψ and u_ϕ, respectively. The added control signal for controlling $\phi(t)$ is limited to $-\frac{\pi}{3}\leq u_\phi\leq\frac{\pi}{3}$. For this case, we require a speed that is strictly positive, limited to $0.2\leq v(t)\leq 1$.

The objective function in the CCTOC problem will be, for both models, to minimize the total path length. This can be achieved using the objective function $f_0(\mathbf{x}(t),\mathbf{u}(t))=|v(t)|$ in (1). The absolute value is formulated using a slack variable and an epigraph formulation [26] to be able to use it in the ACADO software toolkit.

B. Simulation Results

In this section, solutions from the following four trajectory planning problems will be presented

- *P1*: $x_{t_0}=[1,1,0,0,0]$, $x_{t_f}=[9,9,0,0,0]$, $\Delta_\gamma=0.02$, using prediction horizon $N=30$, the motion model (13) and environment specified by (a) in Figure 4.



(a) *P1* (b) *P2*

(c) *P3* (d) *P4*

Fig. 5: The resulting trajectories for the four trajectory planning problems. The only way to get from initial to final state in *P4* is via the hole in the middle.

- *P2*: $x_{t_0} = \left[1,1,\frac{\pi}{2},1,0\right]$, $x_{t_f} = \left[15.5,5.5,\frac{\pi}{2},0,0\right]$, $\Delta_\gamma = 0.01$, using $N = 40$, the motion model (13) and environment specified by (b) in Figure 4.
- *P3*: $x_{t_0} = \left[1,1,\frac{\pi}{4},1,1,0,0\right]$, $x_{t_f} = \left[9,9,\frac{\pi}{2},1,1,0,0\right]$, $\Delta_\gamma = 0.02$, using $N = 40$, the motion model (14) and environment specified by (c) in Figure 4.
- *P4*: $x_{t_0} = [6,6,0,9,1,0,-\pi]$, $x_{t_f} = [6,6,0,-9,1,0,-\pi]$, $\Delta_\gamma = 0.04$, using $N = 40$, the motion model (14) and environment specified by (d) in Figure 4.

In Figure 5 (a) we have a trajectory planning problem with two homotopy classes, where our algorithm finds a solution in the homotopy class to the left of the Disconnected obstacle. Figure 5 (b) is a challenging maze-type problem, which requires the largest amount of SQP iterations (see Figure 6) due to the complex environment. This is, to the best of the authors' knowledge, the first application of shooting methods for this type of problems. The resulting numbers of SQP iterations from *P3* and *P4* indicate that our method scales well in higher dimensions, which is one of the main advantages of the proposed method. One problem which is challenging for the sampled-based methods is the torus example in Figure 5 (d), since it is required to draw samples which brings the platform through the hole to get pass the obstacle [1]. In our experiments, this problem in fact turns out to be the simplest one in terms of number of SQP iterations. From the resulting trajectories in Figure 5, it can be seen that our emulated version of Algorithm 2 manages to find a solution for all four problems and the solutions seem to be of practical relevance. ACADO out-of-the-box,




Fig. 6: Total number of SQP iterations for the four trajectory planning problems. The blue bar represents the number of iterations during the final homotopy step.

without our proposed homotopy approach, was not able to solve any of these problems due to the non-convex inequality constraints representing the obstacles.

From our experiments, we note that it is highly relevant to use QP solvers that efficiently can solve problems with long prediction horizons N, such as those presented in [28], [29], [30], which have a computational complexity that grows as $\mathcal{O}(N)$. For challenging problems, the recent result in [31], which gives a computational complexity as low as $\mathcal{O}(\log N)$ would be useful.

Just as for the regular case in numerical optimal control, there is no guarantee that we find a globally optimal solution, not even the globally optimal one for the explored homotopy class, due to the non-convex nonlinear dynamics. However, the locally optimal trajectories produced make sense, are practically useful and are similar to what you would expect for these problems.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

We have introduced a method that we call Sequential Homotopy Quadratic Programming (SHQP) that combines the standard SQP method with the homotopy method. The result is a new method that has promising properties to compute useful local solutions to NLP problems with non-convex inequality constraints. An important application of the SHQP algorithm considered in the paper is to solve motion planning problems involving non-convex environments. One use of the algorithm is to compute trajectories offline. However, because of the good warm-start properties of SQP methods, it is also expected to be well suited for reactive planning online when information about the environment is constantly updated. A proof-of-concept implementation of the algorithm is in numerical experiments applied to four motion planning problems including a challenging maze problem in 2D as well as two 3D problems. The result is that it handles both challenging environments as well as higher dimensions in a very promising way.

The results presented in this paper can be extended in several ways. One extension is to integrate and implement Algorithm 2 in a state-of-the-art SQP solver suited for CC-TOC problems with long prediction horizons. Furthermore, another important future work is to develop an obstacle object and classification framework, and to automatically select suitable homotopy maps (i.e., how the obstacle is

"introduced") depending on the geometrical and topological structure of each obstacle. Another important extension is to investigate how to adaptively update the step size of the homotopy parameter more generally and flexibly by utilizing information from the SQP iterations similar to what is done in [14].

REFERENCES

[1] S. M. LaValle, *Planning Algorithms*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 2006.

[2] J. T. Betts, *Practical methods for optimal control and estimation using nonlinear programming*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2010.

[3] S. Karaman and E. Frazzoli, "Incremental sampling-based algorithms for optimal motion planning", *Robotics Science and Systems VI*, 2010.

[4] Y. Li, Z. Littlefield, and K.E. Bekris, "Asymptotically optimal sampling-based kinodynamic planning", *The International Journal of Robotics Research 35.5*, pp. 528-564, 2016.

[5] S. Karaman and E. Frazzoli, "Sampling-based optimal motion planning for non-holonomic dynamical systems", *Robotics and Automation (ICRA), 2013 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 5041-5047, 2013.

[6] Y. Kuwata, et al., "Motion planning in complex environments using closed-loop prediction", *AIAA Guidance, Navigation and Control Conference and Exhibit*, 2008.

[7] C. Rösmann, et al., "Trajectory modification considering dynamic constraints of autonomous robots", *Robotics; Proceedings of ROBOTIK 2012; 7th German Conference on Robotics*, VDE, 2012.

[8] O. Ljungqvist, et. al., "Lattice-based Motion Planning for a General 2-trailer system", To appear in *IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium*, 2017. [Online]. Available: https://arxiv.org/abs/1703.03616. [Accessed: 20- Mar- 2017]

[9] K. Shin and N. McKay, "Minimum-time control of robotic manipulators with geometric path constraints", *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control 30.6*, pp. 531-541, 1985.

[10] E. Gilbert and D. Johnson, "Distance functions and their application to robot path planning in the presence of obstacles", *IEEE Journal on Robotics and Automation 1.1*, pp. 21-30, 1985.

[11] K. Berntorp, et al., "Models and methodology for optimal trajectory generation in safety-critical roadvehicle manoeuvres", *Vehicle System Dynamics 52.10*, pp. 1304-1332, 2014.

[12] P. Ferbach and J. Barraquand, "A method of progressive constraints for manipulation planning", *IEEE Transactions on Robotics and Automation 13.4*, pp. 473-485, 1997.

[13] P. Ferbach, "A method of progressive constraints for nonholonomic motion planning", *IEEE Transactions on Robotics and Automation 14.1*, pp. 172-179, 1998.

[14] P. Deuflhard, H-J. Pesch, and P. Rentrop, "A modified continuation method for the numerical solution of nonlinear two-point boundary value problems by shooting techniques", *Numerische Mathematik* 26.3, pp. 327-343, 1976.

[15] W. E. Bosarge, "Iterative continuation and the solution of nonlinear two-point boundary value problems", *Numerische Mathematik 17.4*, pp. 268-283, 1971.

[16] J. L. Speyer and D.H. Jacobson, *Primer on Optimal Control Theory*, SIAM, Advances in Design and Control, volume 20, 2010.

[17] E. Polak, "An historical survey of computational methods in optimal control", *SIAM 15.2*, pp. 553-584, 1973.

[18] A. V. Rao, "A survey of numerical methods for optimal control", *Advances in the Astronautical Sciences 135.1*, pp. 497-528, 2009.

[19] B. Houska, H. J. Ferreau, and M. Diehl, "ACADO Toolkit: An Open-Source Framework for Automatic Control and Dynamic Optimization", *Optimal Control Applications and Methods 32.3* , pp. 298-312, 2011.

[20] A. Wächter and L. T. Biegler, "On the implementation of an interior-point filter line-search algorithm for large-scale nonlinear programming", *Mathematical programming 106.1*, pp. 25-57, 2006.

[21] P. E Gill, W. Murray, and M.A. Saunders, "SNOPT: An SQP algorithm for large-scale constrained optimization", *SIAM 47.1*, pp. 99-131, 2005.

[22] J. Nocedal and S.J. Wright, *Numerical Optimization*, Springer New York, 2006.

[23] S. Mandavilli and L.M. Patnaik, "Genetic algorithms: A survey", *Computer 27.6*, pp. 17-26, 1994.

[24] M. Diehl, et al., "Fast direct multiple shooting algorithms for optimal robot control", *Fast motions in biomechanics and robotics*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 65-93, 2006.

[25] E. L. Allgower and K. Georg, *Numerical continuation methods: an introduction*, Vol. 13, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

[26] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex optimization*, Cambridge university press, 2004.

[27] S. Bhattacharya, M. Likhachev, and V. Kumar, "Identification and representation of homotopy classes of trajectories for search-based path planning in 3D", *Robotics: Science and Systems VII*, 2012.

[28] G. Frison, *Algorithms and methods for high-performance model predictive control*, Ph.D. dissertation, Technical University of Denmark (DTU), 2015.

[29] I. Nielsen, *On Structure Exploiting Numerical Algorithms for Model Predictive Control*, dissertation, Linköping University Electronic Press, 2015.

[30] D. Axehill and A. Hansson, "A Dual Gradient Projection Quadratic Programming Algorithm Tailored for Model Predictive Control" *Proceedings of the 47th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 3057-3064, 2008.

[31] I. Nielsen and D. Axehill, "A parallel structure exploiting factorization algorithm with applications to Model Predictive Control" *Proceedings of the 54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 3932-3938, 2015.